

## **Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of August 14, 2013**

**Members Present:** Capi Wampler, Brendan Ross, Nan Chase, Jo Stephenson, Patricia Cothran, J. Ray Elingburg, David Carpenter, Woodard Farmer, Tracey Rizzo

**Members Absent:** Brian Cook, David Nutter, Sue G. Russell

**Staff:** Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner

**Public:** Joe Scully, Andy Gardner, Kate Dilworth, David Patterson, Steven Sreb, Zoe Schumaker, Michael McDonough

**Call to Order:** Chair Wampler calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum present.

**Adoption of Minutes:** Commissioner Carpenter moves to adopt the July 10, 2013 minutes as written.  
Second by: Commissioner Ross  
Vote for: ALL

### **Consent Agenda:**

**Owner/Applicant:** Angela Threadgill  
**Subject Property:** 45 Birch Street  
**Hearing Date:** August 14, 2013  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9639.93-6462  
**Zoning District:** RS-8

### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – photo of front facade; Exhibit C – photo of existing window from ground level; Exhibit D – photo of salvaged window; Exhibit E – photo of existing window from porch roof; Exhibit F – drawing showing existing window; Exhibit G – drawing showing proposed window; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits H and I.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

HRC Minutes  
August 14, 2013h

3. That the application is to replace non-historic aluminum jalousie window in front gable of home with salvaged vertical four-light wood window to match existing historic upper sashes on the house. Replace deteriorated wood siding at front gable as needed to accommodate new window dimensions. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Windows & Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  - a. The salvaged window is wood and will match the existing bungalow sash style on the house.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Rizzo

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Rizzo

Vote for: ALL

## Public Hearings:

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** Kevin Westmoreland  
**Subject Property:** 3 Boston Way  
**Hearing Date:** August 14, 2013  
**Historic District:** Biltmore Village  
**PIN:** 9647.79-0891  
**Zoning District:** CBI

<b>Staff Comments</b>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p><b>Property Description:</b> R.S. Smith Cottage – constructed @ 1902.</p> <p><b>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</b> Construct 18” high brick wall along the front perimeter of the property per attached drawings. <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></p>
-----------------------	--

	<p><b>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines &amp; Submittal Requirements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planting beds should be located in traditional areas of the site</li> <li>2. Large grass areas are encouraged</li> </ol> <p>The guidelines for Site Design, found on pages 23-26 in Book I, General Design Guidelines and Policies of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines adopted October 1, 1988 were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends a hedge around the perimeter or some other non-permanent site feature to keep patrons off the grass.</p> <p><b>Reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed wall is not in character with the cottage district.</li> <li>2. Grass areas are encouraged.</li> <li>3. Yard edges should be defined with hedges.</li> </ol>
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	<p>Joe Scully, co-owner of the Corner Kitchen, presents reasons they would like to build a small wall. He shows photographs of the area, noting it is unsightly and grass will not grow there. He says over 100,000 people come into their restaurant every year, and says the area around the sign is often used for photo shoots.</p> <p>He wants an opportunity to put in attractive plantings and says the wall could be used for seating. He notes a solution suggested by Ms. Merten, using posts and a chain, would pose a tripping hazard.</p>

#### Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

#### Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Chair Wampler asks if the applicant has examples of similar treatments in the district. Mr. Scully says there are planters at the Biltmore office, Bellagio and New Morning Gallery, and a rock wall next door at 4 All Souls Crescent. Commissioner Rizzo notes these are not in the Cottage area of the district. Commissioner Chase says virtually every lot in the Cottage area is at grade.</p> <p>Ms. Merten suggests the applicant consider a hedge, perhaps boxwood, trimmed to the same dimensions as the wall. Mr. Scully agrees this might be a good solution, and says he would like to withdraw his application and submit a landscaping plan as a Minor Work.</p>
--

#### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** Kate Dilworth  
**Subject Property:** 101 Cumberland Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** August 14, 2013  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.12-04-9601  
**Zoning District:** RM-8

<p><b>Staff Comments</b></p>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p><b>Property Description:</b> MacKenzie House. Early 20th century 2-story irregularly shaped vernacular stucco dwelling. Wide porch with Montford brackets, possibly designed by R. S. Smith. Before 1907.</p> <p><b>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</b> Construct a 2<sup>nd</sup> story addition per attached plans and specifications. 1) Replace pebbledash on main level with wood lapped siding with 5" reveal and add shingles to match rest of house on 2<sup>nd</sup> story. 2) North elevation: add new one over one wood window on 2<sup>nd</sup> level between existing windows and new window to addition and relocate lower level window. 3) East elevation: remove three small 2<sup>nd</sup> story windows and replace with gang of three new one over one wood windows and single one over one wood window on addition and remove existing non-historic windows and double door on lower level and replace with new wood one over one wood windows and new (insert specifications) door. 4) South elevation: Add new window on main level of existing house and new window in addition on 2<sup>nd</sup> story. 5) Addition will be painted to match existing. 6) Install new dark color asphalt shingle roof. <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></p> <p><b>HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines &amp; Submittal Requirements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need specifications for new rear door</li> <li>2. New window openings should be confined to the rear or non-character defining façade</li> </ol> <p>The guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89, the guidelines for Masonry and Stucco found on pages 64-65 and the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p><b>Reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The addition is confined to the rear of the house and does not obscure character defining features.</li> <li>2. The addition is designed to be compatible with the existing building materials texture, color and character.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Applicant(s)</b></p>	<p>Andy Gardner, Builtwright Construction, passes around additional photographs of the house to the Commissioners, pointing out where there would be changes. He describes some of the options the homeowner is considering for the new windows, says they will be wood. He notes the original windows do not have divisions and will be easy to match. He says a window on the north face would be beneficial in the planned master bath. He notes this window would be hard to see from the street, given the proximity of the house next door and a line of trees.</p> <p>Mr. Gardner shows photographs of the rear of the house and points out</p>

	<p>windows and doors that are not original, and evidence of a previous addition. He shows a photograph that show mortices for the original shutters, and says the owner would like to add reproductions at a later date. Ms. Merten notes this is not part of the application.</p> <p>Kate Dilworth, homeowner, says she hopes to preserve the historic character of her home within a budget. She notes there were no storm windows in 1905, and there is a window in her kitchen which is wood on the outside and vinyl on the inside she wishes had not been installed. She wants to make sure the Commission knows she intends to be as sensitive as possible to historic concerns with any changes she makes.</p>
--	--

### Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

### Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Carpenter points out trim options, and notes they would add space not shown in the drawings. He adds there are magnetic indoor storm windows that would be a good option for the homeowner.

*(Commissioner Chase leaves, 4:46 pm)*

Commissioner Stephenson says her only concern with the addition is the proposal to replace stucco with wood siding. Mr. Gardner says the peppledash would be difficult to reproduce, and points out areas it is loose and has been poorly patched in the rear. Commissioner Ross asks him to point out areas he wants to replace the stucco, Mr. Gardner does this. Chair Wampler asks why they don't want to replace it in kind. Mr. Gardner says the homeowner prefers siding.

Commissioner Rizzo asks if wood shakes could be used, Ms. Merten says that would also be introducing a new material. Commissioner Stephenson reads Guideline #6 under Masonry and Stucco, that states if replacement of a large masonry surface is necessary it should be replaced in kind.

Ms. Merten asks if any Commissioner is comfortable with the wood siding (*no*). Mr. Gardner consults the homeowner and says they would be happy to amend their application to stucco on the main level.

Commissioner Stephenson asks about the framing of the bay window, notes traditionally it would have a base and not just project from the house. Mr. Gardner says the drawings have not been finalized, and he can add a base.

Commissioners Stephenson, Ross and Farmer discuss the request to add windows to the existing structure. They agree it is not appropriate on the character-defining south side, then discuss whether the north side might be possible, since it is not very visible. Ms. Merten suggests the applicants consider rearranging the floor plan in case a window is not approved for the bathroom, by switching the location of a closet. Ms. Dilworth says that was considered, but there is potential for a mold problem. Commissioner Stephenson says this could be avoided with ventilation. Chair Wampler notes the interior floor plan is not the Commission's concern. Commissioners Rizzo and Stephenson say another consideration is that the addition establishes a new window pattern on the north side, and they wonder if not allowing the window on the north existing elevation would interrupt the flow. Ms. Merten agrees and says she is comfortable with adding a window to the

north side.

Ms. Dilworth asks to amend her application to use pebbledash stucco on the rear elevation, and to remove her request to add a window on the south side bottom floor. Discussion follows about adding the north window and Ms. Merten suggests this part of the application could be continued.

Chair Wampler asks if there are any concerns about removing and replacing the three second story windows in the rear, which are not original (*none*).

Ms. Dilworth asks to continue the portion of her application asking for a window on the north side of the existing structure.

### Commission Action

#### MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – existing site plan; Exhibit B – four pages of floor plans including existing ground floor, existing second floor, new ground floor and new second floor; Exhibit C – eight pages of elevations including existing west, north, east and south and proposed west, north, east and south; Exhibit D – ten pages of photographs showing existing elevations and repaired pebbledash; Exhibit E – five pages of window photographs and specifications; Exhibit F – five pages of neighborhood homes with similar features; Exhibit G – four photographs of existing structure (*submitted 8/14/13*); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits H and I.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct a 2<sup>nd</sup> story addition per attached plans and specifications. 1) Replace pebbledash on main level and add shingles to match rest of house on 2<sup>nd</sup> story. 2) East elevation: remove three small 2<sup>nd</sup> story windows and replace with gang of three new one over one wood windows and single one over one wood window on addition and remove existing non-historic windows and double door on lower level and replace with new wood one over one wood windows and new wood door. 3) Addition will be painted to match existing. 4) Install new dark color asphalt architectural shingle roof. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89, the guidelines for Masonry and Stucco found on pages 64-65 and the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

- a. The addition is confined to the rear of the house and does not obscure character defining features.
  - b. The addition is designed to be compatible with the existing building materials texture, color and character.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Farmer

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

**With the following conditions:**

1. **Rear door specifications be submitted for staff review.**
2. **Revised drawing of addition be submitted for staff review, showing pebbledash and bay window fully framed.**

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Farmer

Vote for: ALL

**This portion of the application to be continued:**

North elevation: add new one over one wood window on 2<sup>nd</sup> level between existing windows and relocate lower level window.

### **Agenda Item**

**Owner/Applicant:** Michael McDonough  
**Subject Property:** 152 Montford Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** August 14, 2013  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.12-0436  
**Zoning District:** RM-8

<b>Staff Comments</b>	<p>Ms. Merten show slides and gives some history of the property. She reports the windows are still in place under the aluminum siding, and a Minor Work has been issued to remove the siding. She describes the change of use process, and says it seems the siding on the front was always different than the sides. She says the applicant's design attempts to differentiate the new from the old. She reviews the following report.</p> <p><b>Property Description from National Register nomination:</b> (Pentecostal Tabernacle) Late 19th early 20th century temple form structure, formerly a</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>grocery, with false front. Altered. Before 1907 (S)</p> <p><b>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</b> Rehabilitate property for residential and commercial use per attached plans and specifications. Work will include the following items. 1) Remove metal flue and brick chimney. 2) South elevation: remove metal door, stair and landings. Cut opening and install new (insert specs) door. 3) West/rear elevation: cut and install new aluminum clad, full light entrance door. Install new pair of full light aluminum clad doors on 2<sup>nd</sup> level. Construct 6' x 10' entry porch with balcony above suspended by 3" metal plate bracketed posts; porch and balcony will have metal posts with horizontal cable railings; enclose porch sides with vertical wood fencing. 4) North/side elevation: remove basement level door and infill retaining walls. 5) Front elevation: remove metal siding and install painted 8" vertical cement board on board with 1" reveal. Increase overhang on parapet roof 2"; add trim below and metal cap on top. Install new header boards over front windows. Install zinc alloy metal roof on metal purlins supported by curved metal brackets. Install new full light glass and wood door. Install new thin metal handrails. 6) North side elevation: Remove non-historic door and replace with wood and glass door. Replace non historic windows with (insert specs) 7) Restore all original wood windows, trim, siding and masonry as necessary. 8) Site work includes excavating earth to reveal full basement level and construct a brick patio on the north side. Create 2 parking spaces on W. Chestnut St. and relocate the sidewalk; construct stone wall not to exceed 18" in height adjacent to north side patio and stone wall on south side 30" high with metal gate. Replace sloped concrete slab in front of building with brick steps and sidewalk. Remove asphalt and install new street trees, buffer plantings and foundation plantings. Construct 72" high wooden fence to conceal mechanical equipment on south side of structure. <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines &amp; Submittal Requirements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant should provide the following samples: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Doors &amp; windows specifications</li> <li>b. Sample of front board on board material</li> <li>c. Stone sample/gate details</li> <li>d. Brick paver samples</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>The guidelines for Chimneys found on pages 58-59, the guidelines for Wood found on pages 66-67, the guidelines for Masonry and Stucco found on pages 64-65, the guidelines for Porches Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, the guidelines for Accessibility and Life Safety Modifications found on pages 54-55, Sidewalks Streets &amp; Public Infrastructure found on pages 46-47, and the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p><b>Reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The structure will be rehabilitated for a new use that is compatible with its historic character.</li> </ol>
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Michael McDonough, property owner (50% partner with Jade Mountain



	<p>Builders) and Montford resident who lives only three houses away from the project, is sworn in. He explains the layers in his application packet, showing the existing structure, demolition plan and the proposed changes. He submits a photograph of the building taken before the current siding was added. He gives the history of the building, saying it was there by 1905 and had been a grocery store (a Piggly Wiggly). It was converted to a church in the 1950s.</p> <p>The property was zoned residential, and a rezoning has taken place. A landscape plan has been approved by the City showing alternative compliance, due to the sloping access at the front, and they have been approved for a 49 seat restaurant. They received a variance for reduced parking.</p> <p>They started to remove the aluminum siding, but stopped when they ran into some rigid panels they believe may contain asbestos. They are waiting on test results, and developing a protocol for compliance. On the inside they removed finishes which uncovered the original windows.</p> <p>Mr. McDonough submits a photograph that shows how the wings of the front façade extend beyond the sides and the top. The foundation juts out to support the front façade. He notes the siding on the front was not the same as on the sides. The material on the front does not have the German siding two reveal detail, it has a much blander, wider board treatment. He says their design is in keeping with the idea that the front is different from the sides. He thinks the proposed vertical siding keeps the building from looking squatty. They intend to keep the original windows and salvage the original glass, and notes the door is not original. He says the existing elements will be celebrated by painting the sash the same color as the window trim, and placing a large header overall to accentuate the historic parts of the front façade.</p> <p>He notes there is no roof overhang and this side is very exposed to the weather. For this reason he wants to use cement siding that is 8” wide with a 1” reveal, which will help distinguish it as a commercial rather than a residential building. He plans to place a circular device at the eave to illustrate the age or history of the building.</p> <p>Mr. McDonough shows a folded piece of zinc he wants to use as material for the door overhang, he says it is intended to look like draping fabric. The slope of it would hide the metal supports strips, which would also have a draping feel. He notes the design is intended to distinguish the new features from the old.</p> <p>He gives further details on plans for the wide casing around the door, the transition from the two types of siding, the front door, and the entrance. The door will be mostly glass and the existing sloping cement stoop will be removed and replaced with steps. He notes the building’s location is the exact transition on Montford from commercial to residential, and has designed the steps to highlight this shift.</p> <p>Mr. McDonough points out two original dormers, and says they will</p>
--	--

	<p>remove the added portion connecting them. He explains other details on the proposed plan, and submits samples of brick pavers and stones for the extension of the wing wall. He describes landscaping plans to correct drainage and keep people from walking behind the building as they do currently.</p> <p>He submits two drawings showing metal gate and railing details, he says these are thin and will be used so the building shows through them easily. He describes the vertical plank screening that will be used to hide the restaurant trash and supplies. They will remove an old boiler and chimney. There will be new double door at the rear of the 2<sup>nd</sup> level. The lower level in the back will have a wood metal clad SIMCO door, residential style with 5" wide casing to match the original windows.</p> <p>On the Chestnut Street side, openings on the ground level have been buried, and are filled in. They intend to reveal them, repair them, and use some of them in their original manner. They hope to save as much roof material as possible. They are trying not to add new windows.</p> <p>He shows recently painted 8" board samples proposed for the front siding, and says he may want to use a more narrow, 6" wide board with a tight reveal. He doesn't want it to look like T111.</p>
--	--

### **Commission Comments/Discussion**

Commissioner Stephenson asks if they intend to remove the asbestos siding and wonders if there may be original siding underneath it on the front. She says it looks like there might be, from the projection of the trim on the windows being different on the front from the sides. Mr. McDonough says they will probably try to remove the asbestos, and if anything original is found that would be a game changer.

Commissioner Carpenter says the application asks the Commission to consider two different styles. He says the Carpenter Gothic board and batten style is not found on commercial false storefront, and that is not the style of the rest of the structure. He doesn't know how it would fit into the Montford guidelines.

Commissioner Rizzo asks Ms. Merten if a commercial structure has to follow the guidelines the same way. Ms. Merten reads from p. 66 under Wood, and says if wooden siding is found underneath, the siding would have to stay wood. If it is not, a new material would have to be compatible. She notes the same is found under Porches, Entrances and Balconies. She says the Secretary of the Interiors Standards say a new use requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and environment. She thinks the proposed design meets this requirement.

Chair Wampler notes on page 57 fabric awnings are allowed. Ms. Merten says this refers to houses. Commissioner Carpenter says the metal curved brackets are not found anywhere else in Montford. Chair Wampler asks if this follows the request to make new features distinguishable from original features.

Commissioner Farmer says the front façade is undoubtedly a character defining feature, and though he appreciates the design, he doesn't think it is consistent with the history of the building or the district. He says there is no evidence of Carpenter Gothic in Montford, and the design for the supports of the two porches are too fanciful. Ms. Merten says the guidelines are not very detailed for commercial structures, and the Commission needs to balance the Secretary of the Interior guidelines,

which ask for differentiation, and the Montford guidelines, which require it to blend in.

Mr. McDonough says there is evidence of a previous structure in the rear, perhaps a shipping deck. He asks for the period of significance (1890—1920), and wonders what style the structure would be (vernacular). Ms. Merten says additions after that period may be significant also. Mr. McDonough says he is trying to not create false history in his design, and this is why he steered away from using wood as a solution. He thinks the metal can be thinner, and allows the original building to be seen easier. Ms. Merten says this is encouraged in the guidelines, giving the example of using metal handrails instead of chunky wooden ones.

Commissioner Ross notes the guidelines do not say an addition has to be of the period, it only has to be compatible. She says the design allows the original building to be seen. Mr. McDonough agrees and says if he used wood, then it would have to have Montford details and these would obscure the building. Ms. Merten says if there is nothing to reference, the material can be different. Mr. McDonough says the awnings at Tod's Tasty and Nine Mile also have thin metal supports, and they may be the only commercial references available. He says he can simplify the metal supports, but he does not want to switch to wood.

Commissioner Farmer doesn't think the 'Y' style support is compatible with the building. Mr. McDonough asks what would be traditional metal for the 1920s, and wonders how he would redesign the supports. Commissioner Carpenter says Art Nouveau would fall into the time period, but does not make sense with this building. Commissioner Cothran asks how much effort was put into finding older photographs of the building, whether he had contacted Piggly Wiggly. Mr. McDonough says he looked at the NC Collection at Pack Library, but only found ones similar to those he has submitted.

Commissioner Stephenson and Mr. McDonough discuss options for the rear deck and adjoining fencing, to keep the original building as visible as possible.

Ms. Merten reads from p. 29 of the guidelines, The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, "3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken." Commissioner Carpenter thinks this is further argument against the Carpenter Gothic look. Mr. McDonough asks for clarification about the awning, whether it should be fabric (it could be), or if it could be metal. Commissioner Stephenson says the drapery effect is too dramatic. Commissioner Farmer says a traditional standing seam might be appropriate. Ms. Merten says if it is going to be metal, it should not mimic a standing seam metal. Commissioner Carpenter agrees, thinks that would make it look like a warehouse. Discussion follows about awning options, and some wonder if there should be one at all. Covering the original transom window is a concern. Commissioner Carpenter notes an awning would be removable.

The front siding is discussed. Commissioner Stephenson thinks the vertical treatment, regardless of its quality, would be seen as T111. She thinks originally the siding would have been the same on all four sides. Chair Wampler agrees. Mr. McDonough notes there are shingles on some portions of the building. Ms. Merten says the Commission could wait for the evidence before making a decision on the front siding. If nothing is found, then the siding would need to be compatible with the building and the district, and horizontal would be more compatible. It is agreed uncovered front siding evidence and changes to the entrance design are reasons to continue the review to the September meeting.

Mr. McDonough says they intend to apply for state and federal historic tax credits, and this is a

consideration in making the new elements distinct from the original features.

### Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
Steve Sreb	Mr. Sreb asks if the applicant has considered switching the entrances, putting the entrance to the upstairs units in the front, and the restaurant entrance in the rear. He notes this would eliminate many of the concerns.

### Commission Action

Mr. McDonough asks to continue his application.

Chair Wampler asks for a motion to continue this item to the September meeting.

Motion by: Commissioner Farmer

Second by: Commissioner Carpenter

Vote for: ALL

### Preliminary Review:

None

### Other Business:

**Montford guideline revisions for accessory structures.** Chair Wampler asks if Ms. Merten received any feedback after she sent the recommendations to the Commission (she did not.) Ms. Merten explains the committee was formed in December and looked primarily at accessory structures, with some attention to primary structures. The size and location of accessory structures was the focus. One change made had to do with the replacement of a carriage house, garage or accessory structure which should be in the original location, unless that location is problematic. She says Sanborn maps could be used to determine that location. She said historic structures often do not meet current setback requirements, and the maps are used to justify variances and allow them to be put in the original locations.

Ms. Merten reports the committee struggled with the scale recommendation, there had not been a percentage defined before. The new guideline says the structures should be no more than 30% of the scale of the main house and should be no taller than 1½ stories high, unless reconstructing a historic accessory structure based on accurate documentation.

Chair Wampler asks what the word ‘problematic’ refers to in Guideline #5 for Carriage Houses, Garages and Other Accessory Structures, and says that term may be too vague. Ms. Merten discusses possible clarifications for this with Commissioners Farmer, Rizzo, Farmer, Elingburg, Cothran and Mr. McDonough and Patterson, they determine “conflicts with other guidelines or creates site-specific hardships” would be better. This change is made to the revisions.

Commissioner Rizzo asks how neighborhood input was sought, and what was received. Mr. McDonough says he wrote a newsletter article, and updates were given at the monthly neighborhood meetings. Ms. Merten said she received two inquiries, one was about building a two story structure, and another pertaining to primary structure guidelines.

Commissioner Farmer suggests a rewording of a sentence in Guideline #5 in New Construction - Primary Structures, omitting “where the original historic structures were smaller in scale as documented on Sanborn maps or historical photographs” and adding “unless reconstructing an historic structure based on accurate documentation” after “should be smaller in scale in keeping with the historical context.” This change is made to the revisions.

Mr. McDonough says applicants and future commissioners should be reminded that this historical evidence of scale should be considered by studying the Sanborn maps.

Ms. Merten says there is another guideline that says the same thing (she reads Guideline #8) and she is not sure both are needed. Commissioner Farmer says it wouldn't hurt. Ms. Merten says pattern is important, and notes if there had not been a previous structure, a new one could be allowed if it followed the pattern (for example smaller structures along an alley).

Ms. Merten explains revisions to the Roof section, and says graphic illustrations will be added for the metal 5v crimp, the standing seam roof styles and the snow guards. She says the revisions will be posted quickly on the website, but it will be awhile before the guidelines are reprinted.

Chair Wampler asks for public comment.

Montford resident Zoe Schumaker compliments the committee for their work on this issue, including the wordsmithing that was done at the meeting. She says she appreciates the infill that is being done in Montford, and the investments being made in the neighborhood. She thinks there is an imminent threat of over large structures, loss of green space and a change in the character of the neighborhood. She says the hard part is when things are not spelled out in the guidelines. She knows they cannot be so restrictive that no one is willing to invest in the neighborhood, but there is a danger of loopholes. She thinks the committee should continue to refine and improve the guidelines and make them clearer.

Ms. Schumaker says she understood there would be a statement of whether something was a primary or accessory structure on the application itself, and wants to know if her understanding was correct. Ms. Merten says that is already addressed on the application. Chair Wampler reads parts of the application that pertain. Ms. Schumaker says it needs to be clear, if something called a utility structure was really going to be a primary residence, would there be design guidelines that needed to be addressed. Commissioner Rizzo agrees, and notes sometimes an applicant has described their project as a utility building, when the intention is to place an apartment over a garage. Chair Wampler and Ms. Merten note there is a place for a project description.

Ms. Schumaker asks if someone was building a new secondary structure behind an existing structure, and the zoning was such that it could be a single family residence, would only the accessory guidelines apply. Ms. Merten says single family structures can be built behind an existing structure, and the Commission only has control over how it looks, not the use. She notes they defined scale in the revisions. She reads the definition of accessory structures. She says it can look like a primary structure or a utility structure, both are allowed.

Commissioner Farmer says perhaps it is a zoning issue that Ms. Schumaker wants addressed if she wants to prevent multi-family dwellings. Ms. Schumaker says she does not want to prevent residences, says her issue is not with use but with scale. She acknowledges her own house would not have been approved if the suggested guideline revisions had been in place. She also recognizes that if every house built behind a house is bigger than the one in front, it would change the setting. She repeats her concern is with the neighborhood setting and loss of green space, and she doesn't think she is alone in this concern. She thinks it would be helpful if new structures were staked out before the Commissioners visited a site, so they could fully understand

the impact in a visual fashion.

Steven Sreb lives at 42 Tacoma Street, which is not in the district, but says he has just purchased a lot that is included in the historic district. He is concerned about the accessory structure he intends to build there, and says he had talked with Ms. Merten about it. He says the City would allow him to build something 25% of the main structure size, or 500 SF, whichever is larger. He wonders why the Commission would make a guideline that differs from the City's rule, and worries that this will affect his plans. He suggests the guidelines take effect in the future, so that those currently involved in the process are not affected.

Mr. Sreb says he is interested in trends for accessory structures, the tiny house movement and affordable housing. He notes Montford is an urban neighborhood, and thinks the Commission has a responsibility to look at the future of Montford and how it serves the community as a whole. He encourages the Commission to leave the word "should" in regards to the 30% scale, so there will be flexibility.

Commissioner Farmer asks how 30% is a concern, since it is more generous than 25%. Mr. Sreb says it is the 500 SF maximum that is an issue. He is thinking of building a 1400 SF house, so would only be able to build something 420 SF with the 30% ruling. He notes anything smaller than 500 SF is very difficult for living spaces.

Commissioner Rizzo asks if the committee considered adopting the City's 25%/500SF rule. Ms. Merten says they did not, and explains 30% is only an average in the neighborhood, she found things from 20 – 40% when she surveyed the neighborhood. She agrees with Mr. Sreb about density, noting historically Montford was more dense than it presently. She says they could add 'or 500 SF, whichever is larger'. Commissioner Farmer notes 'should' is used, not 'shall', and that gives flexibility. Chair Wampler asks if anyone opposes adding 'or 500 SF, whichever is larger'.

Mr. McDonough says the guidelines refer to scale, and the zoning refers to livable area. The footprint and scale should be determined in regards to the main structure. He says a designer could build in more livable space without changing the footprint or scale. He notes alleyways are integral to Montford, and they should not look like streets.

Chair Wampler asks for a motion to adopt the revisions to the guidelines.

Motion by: Commissioner Farmer

Second by: Commissioner Carpenter

Vote for: Commissioners Carpenter, Elingburg, Farmer, Stephenson, Rizzo and Wampler

Vote against: None

Abstained: Commissioners Cothran and Ross

**Preservation plan update.** Ms. Merten says the plan is moving ahead, she will be sending out a draft of the RFP to the Executive Committee in the next few days, asking for their input. Chair Wampler reminds the Commissioners that they are required to comment when Ms. Merten asks for input.

Commissioner Ross moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Cothran

Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 7:51 pm.